

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 072 598

EC 051 109

AUTHOR	Bennett, Mildred E.; And Others
TITLE	Prescriptive Teaching Workshop Resource Manual.
INSTITUTION	New Providence Board of Education, N.J.
SPONS AGENCY	New Jersey State Dept. of Education, Trenton. Div. of Research, Planning, and Evaluation.
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	75p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; *Diagnostic Teaching; *Educational Programs; Elementary School Students; *Exceptional Child Education; Language Handicapped; *Learning Disabilities; Neurologically Handicapped; Perceptually Handicapped; Program Planning; *Resource Guides; Workshops


ABSTRACT

The resource manual describes procedures for replication of a 1 year Prescriptive Teaching Workshop project, a Title III educational program designed to maintain the learning disabled elementary school child in the regular classroom with additional special workshop help in order to raise his academic achievement. Evaluation of the student is by a sample screening questionnaire and a listed test battery. Data tables give attitudinal assessments and achievement test scores of students in the model program both prior to and following workshop participation. Necessary personnel are said to include a director, a psychologist, a learning disability teacher consultant, and a social worker. Team teaching of regular and special education teachers is stressed. Sample evaluation and progress report forms are included. Workshop materials are listed as are publishers' addresses and prices. Cost effectiveness of the model program for 1 year is evaluated. Parent and community support of the workshop program is seen to be essential. An address is provided from which program information and a filmstrip may be obtained. (DB)

PRESCRIPTIVE
TEACHING
WORKSHOP



R_x



RESOURCE
MANUAL

NEW PROVIDENCE SCHOOL DISTRICT
NEW PROVIDENCE, NEW JERSEY

New Providence School District
309 South Street
New Providence, New Jersey 07974

ED 072598

**PRESCRIPTIVE
TEACHING
WORKSHOP
RESOURCE
MANUAL**

The State Department of Education wishes to bring to the attention of educators certain Projects which have become operative in the state with the aid of ESEA Title III.

These Projects have been evaluated as substantially meeting the objectives of finding solutions to educational problems. The material on such a Project should have relevance for many school districts.


Written by

Mildred E. Bennett
Thomas J. Newell, Jr.
Patricia Suchena

Carl S. Marburger

Carl Marburger
Commissioner of Education
New Jersey State Department
of Education

ESEA



**OFFICE OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF RESEARCH, PLANNING & EVALUATION
NEW JERSEY STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION**
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

**NEW
PROVIDENCE
SCHOOL
DISTRICT
1972**

BOARD OF EDUCATION

Robert J. Duch, President
Anthony P. Balestrieri, Vice President
James H. Brennan, Jr.
Janet Bromberg
William F. Humphrey
Ruth Weiss
George Williams

SUPERINTENDENT AND STAFF

John O. Berwick
Superintendent of Schools

Robert A. Lachenauer
Deputy Superintendent of Schools/Board Secretary

Robert G. Gorton
Director of Curriculum and Instruction

PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

Hillview Elementary School
Salt Brook Elementary School
Allen W. Roberts Elementary School
Lincoln Elementary School

The materials presented herein were prepared pursuant to a Grant from the New Jersey State Department of Education under provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title III. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the New Jersey State Department of Education or the United States Office of Education.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
PREFACE	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
I. INTRODUCTION	
Overview	1
Community	1
School District	2
Flow Chart	3
II. GOALS AND EVALUATION	
Needs	7
Criteria for Screening	7
Number of Children	9
Goals and Objectives	10
Screening Check List	11
Performance Details	15
Data Tables	18
III. PERSONNEL AND INSTRUCTION	
Personnel	31
Communication	31
Instructional Strategies	32
Case Study	34
Physical Facilities	41
Materials and Equipment	43

Contents - 2

	<u>Page</u>
Implementation Steps	56
What to Avoid	56
Modifications	57
Phasing-in Suggestions	58
In-Service Training	58
IV. COST EFFECTIVENESS	
Budget	61
Savings	62
Reimbursable Costs	63
V. PARENTS AND COMMUNITY	
Orientation	65
Community Education and Participation	66
Role of the Board of Education	66
Reasons for Continued Board Support	66
How to Enlist Board Support	67

PREFACE

The Prescriptive Teaching Workshop was funded by the Federal Government under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 for a three year period, 1969-1972. Title III funds were used for instructional materials, equipment, and two teachers' salaries. The New Providence Board of Education provided funds for the services of the Project Director and of ancillary personnel.

The purpose of Title III is to encourage the development of innovative programs which offer imaginative solutions to educational problems. This is done in two ways. First, successful educational programs and ideas are disseminated to permit as many educators as possible to learn about them and to adopt or adapt them in accordance with the educational needs of their districts.

This resource manual has been prepared as one of the components of the dissemination plan for the Prescriptive Teaching Workshop. It describes the development and evaluation of the project in detail and offers suggestions for those who are interested in adopting or adapting the project's concepts or methods.

The following materials which describe the project and procedures for its replication are available upon request from the Project Director.

- (1) Educational Programs that Work - A Technical Brief:
Prescriptive Teaching Workshop
- (2) Prescriptive Teaching Workshop Resource Manual
- (3) Filmstrip -tape entitled, Prescriptive Teaching Workshop
(available for loan)

Contact:

Joseph Romanko, Project Director
Director of Special Services
309 South Street
New Providence, New Jersey 07974
(201) 464-9450

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Sincere appreciation is expressed to the following people for their assistance and cooperation in the development and implementation of the Prescriptive Teaching Workshop program:

The Board of Education
Superintendent - John O. Berwick
Project Director - Joseph Romanko
The Child Study Team
The Workshop Teachers
The Staffs of the Elementary Schools
 Elementary principals
 Elementary school teachers
Representatives from the Special Education Department both
 on the State and County levels

The assistance of the following persons in the preparation of dissemination materials is gratefully acknowledged:

Dorothy Soper
Joseph Romanko
Frank Freer
Barry Hampe
Richard Siegel, cover design
Elaine Lukk, photography
Jeannette Ryan, editing
S. C. Bennett, graphics



INTRODUCTION

PREScriptive TEACHING WORKSHOP

I. INTRODUCTION

Overview

The Prescriptive Teaching Workshop is an educational program designed to raise the academic achievement of elementary school students who are hampered by neurological, language, and perceptual-motor problems. A Prescriptive Teaching Center in each of four elementary schools accommodates learning disabled children for part of the day. At other times these students work in regular classrooms utilizing individually prescribed materials. Students whose disabilities are less severe work only in the regular classroom but follow individually prescribed programs. The project's main goal is to maintain the disabled learner in the regular classroom situation. The name, Prescriptive Teaching Workshop, was chosen for this program because it had no stigma attached as do the terms, perceptually impaired, emotionally disturbed, neurologically impaired, and other special class designations. Other terms that may be used interchangeably are resource room, open-end classroom, learning laboratory and educational center.

The important components of the program are team teaching of regular and special education teachers, teacher in-service training, diagnosis of student needs, individually prescribed learning programs, and the use by students of multi-sensory aids. The close relationship between the classroom teacher and the workshop teacher, and the supportive role of the child study team are prerequisites for success.

The project served approximately 150 students during the 1971-1972 school year. The program replaced supplemental instruction for these students in four schools.

Community

New Providence is a suburban community located in the northeast corner of Union County and within an hour's commuting distance of New York City. The town covers an area of 3.7 square miles on a slope between the Watchung Reservation and the Passaic River. It is largely residential but has some light industry.

According to the 1970 Census New Providence has 13,796 residents. Seventy percent of employed male residents are in professional or technical jobs. The number of years of schooling completed by the head of a family is 13.6, and is exceeded by only three communities in the State. The average income per household is \$17,035 and the average price of a house is \$38,600. The adults of New Providence have a high educational attainment, a high income, and a high level of professional-technical employment. Their expectations for their children's educational achievement are concomitantly high.

New Providence has experienced an accelerated growth rate because of the quantity and quality of land available for prime suburban residential housing and because of its accessibility to major job centers. It has attracted young upper staff and middle executive families with a high percentage of school-age children. Business transfers account for a high rate of population and housing turnover.

School District

New Providence school district has 4 elementary schools and 1 high school with a total school population of 3,800, of which 2,600 pupils are enrolled in the elementary school and 1,200 in the high school. The district rents space for its administrative offices. The schools are located throughout town so that each home is within reasonable walking distance of its neighborhood elementary school. Therefore, no transportation is furnished except to handicapped children.

There is also one Roman Catholic parochial school for grades 1 through 8 with an enrollment of 450 and 4 private nursery schools in addition to a fifth for retarded children. A sixth nursery school is planned for 1972-1973.

Since September 1971, each elementary building contains two schools in one, K through 5 and a departmentalized 6th, 7th, and 8th grade middle school.


Recognition of individual differences of children and provision of sufficient opportunities for the development of each one's potential are the basis for all program planning. School experiences are directed toward preparing the child for his role in society and the world of work.

The children of New Providence have a high level of ability as demonstrated by their performance on standardized tests and the number of graduates going on to higher education. The average I. Q. is 114. Eighty-two percent of the class of 1972 is continuing their education.

The average elementary class size is 25. During the 1970-1971 school year, the cost per pupil was \$843.77 in the elementary school and \$1,283.39 in the secondary school. The budget for 1972-1973 provides \$4,549,000 for current expenditures and capital outlay.

New Providence schools have experienced the nation-wide problem created by the population explosion and movement to the suburbs. Between 1950 and 1969 school enrollment grew from 664 to 3,792. Three new elementary schools and the high school were built and expanded. Plans for the 1972-1973 school year provide for additional expansion and improvement of the high school and one elementary school.

STEPS IN SETTING UP PRESCRIPTIVE TEACHING WORKSHOP



EXPLANATION OF FLOW CHART
STEPS IN SETTING UP PRESCRIPTIVE TEACHING WORKSHOP

Director of Special Services will

1. Assess needs.
2. Describe kind of facility that meets needs and includes alternative proposals.
3. Enlist support of staff and administration by following strategies:
 - a. Visit existing Workshop
 - b. View filmstrip-tape overview
 - c. Read Technical Brief describing Workshop
 - d. Read Prescriptive Teaching Workshop Resource Manual
4. Estimate cost of staffing, materials, equipment, and in-service training.
5. Submit proposal and budget for Board of Education approval.
6. After budget is approved, hire a teacher for the Workshop. (Teacher attendance at summer training in Workshop replication is a prerequisite.)

Child Study Team, principal and classroom teachers will

7.
 - a. Learning Disability Teacher Consultant will orient classroom teachers to purpose of Workshop and type of children who could benefit from placement (in-service training).
 - b. Classroom teachers will refer children to Learning Disability Teacher Consultant.
 - c. Learning Disability Teacher Consultant and Child Study Team will evaluate children and recommend for placement.
 - d. Child Study Team, principal, and classroom teacher will meet to select children.
 - e. Director of Special Services or school social worker will meet with parents of children and provide an opportunity for parents to visit Workshop and meet Workshop teacher.
 - f. Principal will assign children to classroom teachers best-suited to meet children's needs.

Learning Disability Teacher Consultant in consultation with Child Study Team and Classroom Teacher will

8. Develop a total program for each child.

Director of Special Services with Learning Disability Teacher Consultant will

9. Specify materials, equipment, and physical facility.
 - a. Learning Disability Teacher Consultant will select materials and equipment needed to implement program.
 - b. Director of Special Services will recommend to Superintendent and principal a room for Workshop central to school program, and compatible in size and layout with self-directed learning experiences, e.g. carrels.

Workshop teacher will

10. Schedule children's programs.
 - a. Children will report to regular classrooms full time at the beginning of school year.
 - b. Workshop teacher will observe children in regular classrooms.
 - c. Workshop teacher will assign specific hours for children's involvement in Workshop in consultation with classroom teachers. Scheduling will be flexible enough to allow for changes during year to fit individual needs and structured enough so that classroom teacher and Workshop teacher are cognizant of children's whereabouts at all times.

Children will

11. Perform in Workshop

Workshop teacher, classroom teacher, and Child Study Team will

12. Evaluate children's performance by following techniques:
 - a. Progress reports to parents at conferences in November, May and other periods as required.
 - b. Quarterly report cards jointly graded by Workshop teacher and classroom teacher.
 - c. Pre- and Post-achievement testing by Workshop teacher.

- d. Attitudinal assessment by psychologist (see Attitudinal Assessment Scale)

Workshop teacher, Director of Special Services, and Superintendent will

- 13. Disseminate information about program
 - a. Workshop teacher to classroom teachers, principal, and Child Study Team.
 - b. Director of Special Services to principals and Superintendent.
 - c. Superintendent to Board of Education, public, and outside agencies.

IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE:

Steps	1	-	5	Budget approval prerequisites
Steps	6	-	9	Pre-performance requirements
Steps	10	-	13	Workshop in operation



GOALS

AND

EVALUATION

II. GOALS AND EVALUATION

Needs

Who are the children with identifiable learning disabilities ?

- . These children have not responded to various teaching approaches in the classroom and need new materials and individualized instructional strategies.
- . They have difficulties in academic, perceptual, and gross-motor areas.
- . They exhibit negative behavioral patterns (e.g. perseveration, withdrawal, inability to screen out noises) of a frequency and degree that interfere with learning. (See Screening Check List, pp. 11-14.)

Criteria for Screening

Teacher referral is the first level of identification of learning disabled children. Children accepted into this program must have had learning problems in more than one skill area and have not responded to efforts of past remediation. There must also be some medical or psychological evidence of disrupted thought processes caused by maturational lag, neurological impairment, communication disorder, or emotional disturbance. Furthermore, the child should not exhibit the kind of behavioral pattern that would interfere seriously with the individualized learning climate in the Workshop.

If a child is already working up to capacity in a regular classroom, it is doubtful that additional involvement in the Workshop will be productive or warranted. However, children classified as neurologically impaired or emotionally disturbed may be able to remain in the regular classroom with the support of the Workshop. The Workshop serves the purpose of giving handicapped children supportive help in a regular school program without resorting to a self-contained, special class and is a means of keeping the child in the educational mainstream.

Other means of helping disturbed youngsters have been attempted over the past few years. Prior to the Workshop the children with pronounced learning disabilities were accommodated by supplemental instruction outside the classroom in perceptual, gross-motor, and academic areas. Although the child functioned well in an individual setting, he continued to be an academic problem in the class. Supplemental teachers found it difficult to communicate as frequently as desired with the classroom teacher. Some children also seemed to be sensitive about leaving the classroom setting. In general, specialized or supplemental perceptual and academic training in isolation proved unproductive.

In addition to supplemental instruction, for a three-year period (1965-1968) children were assigned to a self-contained, special class designated as a class for the neurologically impaired (or N.I. class). Class size was limited to 8 children; therefore only a comparatively few children participated in the program. Supplemental instruction was continued for other children with less severe problems who remained in regular classrooms. Observation by the Child Study Team disclosed that children in the N.I. class were developing emotional reactions to having their programs separated from those of their peer group in regular classrooms. Furthermore, the teachers of the N.I. class did not feel that a self-contained class was the way to remediate the needs of these children. Consequently, the N.I. class was dissolved and the children were returned to regular classrooms where they received help from the Learning Disability Teacher Consultant (LDTC) three times a week. The LDTC also furnished the classroom teacher with specialized materials. In this way the year, 1968-1969, served as in-service training for classroom teachers. The effectiveness of the program was reduced by the pressure of other duties of the LDTC which competed for his time with the children. Furthermore, the classroom teacher seemed overwhelmed by the attempt to return these children to the regular classroom and continued to seek more supportive help.

In summary, the needs of the children with severe learning disabilities were closely observed by the Child Study Team for a four-year period, three years of which some of the children were assigned to an N.I. class and one year of which they were in regular classrooms with supportive help from the LDTC. Out of the recognition of the need to expand what the LDTC was doing grew the first Prescriptive Teaching Workshop.

In the first year of the Workshop 16 children were assigned from grades 1-5; in the second year, 26 children, and in the third year, 50 children. About half the children were from second and third grade. While there are plans to accommodate the middle school in the Workshop, the emphasis will remain on the lower grades. (See table entitled Number of Children in Prescriptive Teaching Workshop, p. 9.)

NUMBER OF CHILDREN
IN PRESCRIPTIVE TEACHING WORKSHOP

<u>Grade Level</u>	<u>1969-70</u>	<u>1970-71</u>	<u>1971-72</u>
1	4	6	6
2	6	5	16
3	3	7	12
4	2	3	7
5	1	5	9
Total:	16	26	50

Goals and Objectives

In attempting to meet the goal of maintaining the disabled learner in the regular classroom, four main objectives have evolved.

(1) Significant reduction of the incidence of behavior associated with personal frustration in students with neurological impairment, perceptual-motor problems, and speech disabilities is the first objective, as well as significant increase in the incidence of student success and adjustment.

To accomplish this objective the student receives a pre- and post-program interview by the same psychologist. Conferences with the Child Study Team, teachers, and parents are held periodically to rate the student's progress and behavior. The Workshop teacher, using specific indices and in consultation with the Child Study Team and the classroom teacher, prescribes a program for each student.

(2) Improvement of students' previous growth rates in reading, arithmetic, and language skills and reduction of retention rates and special class placements is the second objective. The prescription, written especially for each child, enables the Workshop and classroom teachers to meet the child's needs more effectively. The following evaluative instruments are used to accomplish this task; the California Achievement Test, administered at the beginning and at the end of the year with results compared; the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children; Bender-Gestalt; Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities; Frostig Test of Developmental Visual Perception.

(3) The third objective is directed towards those students with disabilities not severe enough to be serviced by the Workshop. Individual prescriptions are designed by the LDTC and the classroom teachers for use in the regular classroom. Tapes, audio-visual aids, programmed materials, listening centers, and controlled readers are among the supplemental materials used. The prescriptive programs are similar in content to the regular classroom material.

(4) Improvement of classroom teachers' ability to identify students with special needs and to assist in designing individual instructional programs for them is the fourth objective. In-service workshops, close working relationships between LDTC and classroom teachers, team-teaching of classroom teacher and Workshop teacher, and continuous communication among all staff personnel combine to accomplish this objective. The Workshop teacher is released from the Workshop one day a week to observe Workshop students in the regular classroom, to confer with the classroom teacher, to teach Workshop and other students in the regular classroom, and to meet with the Child Study Team. This objective supports the educational philosophy of the district, which is recognition of individual differences of children and provision of sufficient opportunities for the individual to develop his potential.

Screening for Prescriptive Workshop Candidate

Date _____

Child's Name _____ Teacher's Name _____

Present Grade _____ School _____

Birthdate _____

Has he ever been retained: _____ Grade _____

Recent Test Data:

Date	Reading	Language	Mathematics	Total
Calif. Achievement	_____	_____	_____	_____
Iowa	_____	_____	_____	_____
Wide-Range	_____	_____	_____	_____
I.Q.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Otis-Lenon	_____	_____	_____	_____
Stanford -Binet	_____	_____	_____	_____
Peabody	_____	_____	_____	_____
Verbal	_____	Performance	Full Scale	_____
W.I.S.C.	_____	_____	_____	_____
Others	_____	_____	_____	_____

Previous Special Service Contacts:

Speech _____

Gross Motor Program _____

Remedial Reading _____

Psychological _____

Learning Disability Specialist Workup _____

Supplemental Tutoring (Include name of persons) _____

Health Record:

Vision _____

Hearing _____

Any medication taken during school hours? _____ What? _____

Any recorded or observed health problem? _____

Academic Functioning: Give approximate functioning grade level for each academic area, the name of text (s) used and the last page completed. Please check appropriate box.

Reading

Mathematics Frustrating ☐ Achieving ☐

Language Frustrating ☐ Achieving ☐

Spelling Frustrating ☐ Achieving ☐

Social Studies Frustrating ☐ Achieving ☐

Science Frustrating ☐ Achieving ☐

Supplemental Materials Frustrating ☐ Achieving ☐

Frustrating ☐ Achieving ☐

Handwriting

Printing _____ Manuscript _____ Forms letters correctly _____ Spaces well _____

Writes too large _____ Writes too small _____

_____ Frustrating ☐ ☐ Achieving ☐ ☐

What do you consider to be his strengths? (Include non-academic areas)

What do you consider to be his weaknesses? (Include non-academic areas)

Perceptual:

Have you noticed any evidence of a perceptual disability? _____ Does he make reversals? _____ Does he have difficulty copying from the board? _____ Does he have difficulty distinguishing left from right? _____ Handedness _____ left _____ right

Fine Motor (Small muscle coordination): Does this child have difficulty writing, cutting, pasting, etc.? _____

Gross Motor (Large muscle coordination): Does this child have difficulty running, skipping, hopping, jumping, etc.? _____

Behavioral Aspects (Check appropriate box)

	Low	Average	High
Is he emotionally stable?			
Can he sustain peer relations?			
Is he responsive to adult direction?			
Can he control impulses?			
Is he hyperactive?			
Is he unusually quiet?			
Is he easily distracted?			
Is he aggressive?			
Is he a wanderer?			
Does he seek attention?			
Is he easily frustrated?			
Does he day dream?			
Does he have temper tantrums?			
Is he destructive?			

Can you cite any other information relevant to this youngster's behavior?

Are you aware of any problems in the home that might be pertinent?

In your contacts with the parents, would you briefly describe their attitude toward the child and his problems.

Any other comments you feel might be helpful. (Use other side if necessary)

Performance Details

For the three years of its operation the Workshop program and the students' progress have been constantly evaluated. In the following section statistical data for 1971-1972 show how the Workshop helped learning disabled youngsters.

Table 1 and 2 are attitudinal assessment scales. Table 3 shows the comparative scores in grade equivalents on the California Achievement Test. Table 4 gives the number of students released from the Workshop. Child number designation refers to the same child in each table.

While slight to substantial gains were made in academic areas for this past year (see Table 3), it must be realized that children with learning disabilities typically score more poorly on tests of achievement than do children without disabilities. Teacher observation is probably a more reliable index of actual academic gains. One of the primary functions of the Workshop is to avoid doing serious emotional damage to children while they are experiencing emotional difficulties. Table 1 indicates slight to substantial growth in terms of eliminating negative behaviors. Table 2, which refers to the child's self-adjustment, indicates slight to substantial gains in terms of the child's feelings about himself. It is, therefore, important to look at the total child rather than merely his achievement test results.

Numerous studies have shown that children with learning disabilities typically develop emotional overlay and behavioral avoidance patterns to frustrating situations. Therefore, the improvement indicated in Tables 1 and 2, which is also substantiated by teacher and parent observation, indicates that one of the primary objectives is being met. That is, the child is not being conditioned to dislike school and to avoid learning.

If this negative damage to the child is avoided, it is very likely, in many cases, that children will be much more apt, as their psychoneurological systems mature, to have successful learning experiences later which will not be measured in terms of this research.

In the model district the Department of Special Services is responsible for student evaluation. Numerous instruments are available for determining the growth of a child. The following is a list of diagnostic tests routinely used by Special Services in identifying learning disabled children.

<u>Name of Test</u>	<u>Measures</u>	<u>Administered by</u>
Wechsler Intelligence Scale for children	Verbal I.Q. Performance I.Q. Full Scale I.Q.	Psychologist
Stanford Binet	General Intelligence Motor Intelligence at some levels Verbal Intelligence	Psychologist
Otis-Lenon	Group Intelligence	Teacher
Peabody-Picture Vocabulary Test	Verbal Vocabulary	Teacher
Raven Progressive Matrices Test	General Intelligence Spatial Reasoning	Psychologist
Illinois Test of Psycho-linguistic Abilities	Language	Speech Therapist
Bender-Gestalt Visual-Motor Test	Visual-Constructive skills Visual recall Motor skills	Psychologist
Benton Test of Visual Retention	Visual constructive skills Visual memory	Psychologist
Botel Word Recognition Test	Slight word vocabulary	LDTC
Botel Phonics Analysis Test	Knowledge of phonetic Application	LDTC
Wepman Test of Auditory Discrimination	Auditory discrimination	LDTC Psychologist
House-Tree-Person Test of Personality	Motor Coordination	Psychologist
Wide Range Achievement Test	Achievement	LDTC
Tests of Basic Skills - California Test Bureau	Achievement	Teacher

<u>Name of Test</u>	<u>Measures</u>	<u>Administered by</u>
Iowa Tests of Basic Skills	Achievement	Teacher
Reading Tests	Reading	Reading specialist LDTC Teacher
A Psychoeducational Evaluation of Basic Learning Abilities (Valett)	Gross motor skills Sensory-motor skills Perceptual-motor skills Language skills Conceptual skills Social skills	LDTC, Teacher
Developmental Test of Visual Perception (Frostig)	Visual perception	LDTC Psychologist
Harris Test of Laterality and Cominance	Laterality	LDTC Psychologist Teacher

DATA TABLE #1

Attitudinal Assessment Scale A

F = fall
S = spring
D = difference

Overall ratings of -2 to -3 are considered inadequate gains;
1 child fell into this category.

Overall ratings of -1 to +2 are considered insignificant gains;
15 children fell into this category.

Overall ratings of +3 to +5 are considered adequate gains;
23 children fell into this category.

Overall ratings of +6 to +8 are considered exceptional gains;
4 children fell into this category.

Child	Disruptive Behavior			Withdrawn			Atypical Peer Conflicts			Irritability			Resistance to Criticism			Absenteeism			Failure to Participate & Interact			Improvement
	F	S	D	F	S	D	F	S	D	F	S	D	F	S	D	F	S	D	F	S	D	
1	2	3	+1	2	2	0	1	3	+2	2	3	+1	2	3	+1	3	3	0	2	3	+1	+6
2	2	2	0	3	3	0	3	3	0	2	2	0	1	2	+1	3	3	0	1	2	+1	+2
3	1	1	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	1	2	+1	1	2	+1	3	2	-1	2	2	0	+1
4	2	2	0	2	3	+1	1	2	+1	2	2	0	1	2	+1	2	3	+1	1	2	+1	+5
5	2	2	0	2	3	+1	2	2	0	2	2	0	1	2	+1	3	3	0	2	2	0	+2
6	2	3	+1	1	2	+1	2	3	+1	2	3	+1	3	3	0	3	3	0	1	2	+1	+5
7	3	3	0	3	3	0	3	3	0	3	3	0	2	3	+1	3	3	0	3	3	0	+1
8	2	3	+1	2	3	+1	2	3	+1	3	3	0	2	3	+1	3	3	0	3	3	0	+4
9	1	2	+1	2	2	0	2	2	0	1	2	+1	1	2	+1	2	2	0	2	2	0	+3
10	2	2	0	1	2	+1	1	2	+1	2	2	0	1	2	+1	2	2	0	2	2	0	+3
11	1	2	+1	2	2	0	1	2	+1	1	2	+1	1	1	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	+3
12	1	2	+1	1	2	+1	2	1	-1	1	1	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	+1
13	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	1	2	+1	1	2	+1	2	2	0	2	2	0	+2
14	1	2	+1	2	2	0	1	2	+1	1	1	0	1	1	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	+2

Child	Disruptive Behavior			Withdrawn			Atypical Peer Conflicts			Irritability			Resistance to Criticism			Absenteeism			Failure to Participate & Interact			Improvement
	F	S	D	F	S	D	F	S	D	F	S	D	F	S	D	F	S	D	F	S	D	
15	2	1	-1	1	3	f2	1	2	f1	2	2	0	1	2	f1	2	1	-1	3	2	-1	f1
16	2	2	0	2	3	f1	2	3	f1	2	2	0	2	3	f1	3	3	0	2	2	0	f3
17	2	2	0	2	3	f1	1	2	f1	1	2	f1	2	3	f1	3	3	0	2	2	0	f4
18	2	3	f1	2	3	f1	2	2	0	2	3	f1	2	2	0	3	3	0	2	3	f1	f3
19	1	2	f1	2	2	0	1	2	f1	1	2	f1	2	2	0	3	3	0	2	2	0	f3
20	2	2	0	1	2	f1	1	2	f1	2	2	0	2	2	0	3	3	0	2	2	0	f2
21	1	2	f1	2	2	0	1	2	f1	1	2	f1	2	2	0	3	3	0	1	2	f1	f4
22	1	2	f1	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	2	0	3	3	0	2	2	0	f1
23	2	2	0	2	2	0	1	2	f1	2	2	0	1	2	f1	3	3	0	2	2	0	f2
24	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	3	f1	2	2	0	1	2	f1	3	3	0	2	2	0	f2
25	2	2	0	2	2	0	1	2	f1	2	2	0	2	2	0	3	3	0	2	2	0	f1
26	2	3	f1	2	3	f1	1	2	f1	1	2	f1	1	2	f1	2	2	0	2	2	0	f1
27	2	2	0	1	2	f1	2	2	0	2	3	f1	2	3	f1	3	3	0	1	3	f2	f3
28	2	3	f1	1	2	f1	2	3	f1	2	3	f1	1	2	f1	3	3	0	1	2	f1	f5
29	1	2	f1	1	2	f1	1	2	f1	2	2	0	1	2	f1	3	3	0	1	1	0	f4
30	1	2	f1	2	2	0	2	3	f1	2	2	0	1	2	f1	3	3	0	2	2	0	f3
31	2	3	f1	2	2	0	2	2	0	1	2	f1	1	2	f1	3	3	0	2	2	0	f3

Child	Disruptive Behavior			Withdrawn			Atypical Peer Conflicts			Irritability			Resistance to Criticism			Absenteeism			Failure to Participate & Interact			Improvement
	F	S	D	F	S	D	F	S	D	F	S	D	F	S	D	F	S	D	F	S	D	
32	2	2	0	2	3	#1	2	3	#1	2	2	0	2	2	0	3	3	0	1	2	#1	#3
33	2	3	#1	1	2	#1	1	2	#1	2	1	-1	1	2	#1	2	2	0	2	2	0	#4
34	3	3	0	2	3	#1	3	3	0	3	3	0	3	3	0	2	3	#1	2	3	#1	#3
35	1	3	#2	3	3	0	1	3	#2	2	3	#1	2	3	#1	1	3	#2	3	3	0	#8
36	1	2	#1	3	3	0	1	3	#2	1	3	#2	1	2	#1	3	3	0	3	3	0	#6
37	3	3	0	2	3	#1	3	3	0	3	3	0	3	3	0	3	3	0	3	3	0	#1
38	2	2	0	2	3	#1	1	2	#1	2	3	#1	2	3	#1	1	3	#2	1	3	#2	#8
39	3	2	-1	3	3	0	2	1	-1	3	2	-1	2	2	0	3	3	0	3	3	0	-3
40	2	3	#1	1	3	#2	3	3	0	3	3	0	3	3	0	3	3	0	3	3	0	#3
41	3	3	0	2	3	#1	2	2	0	2	2	0	3	3	0	1	2	#1	2	3	#1	#3
42	2	3	#1	2	3	#1	1	3	#2	2	2	0	2	2	0	2	3	#1	2	2	0	#5
43	1	3	#2	1	2	#1	1	3	#2	3	2	-1	1	1	0	1	1	0	2	2	0	#4
44	2	3	#1	3	3	0	3	3	0	2	3	#1	2	3	#1	3	3	0	2	2	0	#3

DATA TABLE #2

Attitudinal Assessment Scale B

F = fall
S = spring
D = difference

The data concerning child #31, who has moved from the district are not available.

Overall ratings of -1 to +1 are considered insignificant;
16 children fell into this category.

Overall ratings of +2 to +3 are considered adequate;
25 children fell into this category.

Overall ratings of +4 to +6 are considered exceptions;
2 children fell into this category.

Child	Feeling of Success				Personal Adjustment				Positive Attitude Towards School				Overall Improvement	
	F	S	D		F	S	D		F	S	D			
1	1	3	+2		1	3	+2		1	3	+2		+6	Emotionally disturbed, socially maladjusted-great improvement in all areas-released Feb. 1972
2	2	1	0		1	1	0		1	1	0		-1	Problem with self concept-maternal conflict - released June, 1972
3	2	2	0		1	2	1		1	2	1		+2	Emotionally disturbed-excessive absence due to asthmatic condition - Workshop 1972-1973
4	1	2	+1		2	3	+1		1	2	+1		+3	Marked improvement in academics - Workshop 1972-1973
5	2	2	0		2	2	0		2	3	+1		+1	In Workshop for three years - significant success - released.
6	2	3	+1		1	2	+1		1	2	+1		+3	Negativistic, poor academic adjustment and performance - significant improvement.
7	3	3	0		1	2	+1		3	3	0		+1	Coordination and reversal problems - improved - returned to 2nd grade.
8	2	3	+1		1	2	+1		2	3	+1		+3	Reading is to grade level - math is to ability level - released.
9	1	2	+1		2	2	0		1	2	+1		+2	Released from Workshop - returned to 4th grade in home district - Supplemental instruction 1972-1973
10	2	2	0		2	2	0		2	2	0		0	Released from Workshop June 1972 - Remedial reading 1972-1973
11	2	3	+1		2	2	0		2	2	0		+1	On medication - Workshop 1972-1973
12	1	3	+2		1	2	+1		2	3	+1		+4	Emotionally disturbed - short attention span - Psychiatric help in 1971-1972 - Workshop in 1972-73
13	1	3	+2		2	2	0		2	3	+1		+3	Problem in Adjustment improved - released Dec. 1971 Remedial reading.
14	1	2	+1		1	1	0		2	2	0		+1	Therapy 1971-72 - released by therapist against school wishes-peer conflicts-emotionally disturbed class placement possible in 1972-1973
15	1	2	+1		1	1	0		2	3	+1		+2	Mentally retarded with an emotional overlay-neurologically impaired.

Child	Feeling of Success				Personal Adjustment				Positive Attitude Towards School				Overall Improvement	
	F	S	D		F	S	D		F	S	D			
16	1	2	41		1	2	41		1	2	41		43	Emotional disturbance has lessened.
17	2	2	0		2	3	41		2	2	0		41	Increased self-confidence.
18	1	2	41		1	2	41		1	2	41		43	Improved - released.
19	1	2	41		1	2	41		1	1	0		42	Psychiatric evaluation completed - needs therapy - on medication - some improvement.
20	1	2	41		1	2	41		2	2	0		42	Pressure on child by father - need for family therapy-released - some improvement.
21	1	2	41		1	1	0		1	2	41		42	Gained self confidence - released - remedial reading 1972-1973.
22	1	2	41		1	2	41		1	1	0		42	More independent - less distracted on medication
23	2	2	0		1	2	41		1	2	41		42	Improvement continues.
24	2	2	0		1	2	41		2	2	0		41	Cerebral palsy - family counselling and ophthalmological examination completed - improving in academics - some problems with peer relations.
25	1	2	41		1	2	41		1	2	41		43	Relatively stable.
26	1	2	41		2	2	0		1	2	41		42	Leadership qualities emerging - unrealistic parental academic expectations diminishing.
27	1	2	41		1	1	0		1	2	41		42	Showed borderline type intelligence - general improvement.
28	2	2	0		2	2	0		1	2	41		41	More relaxed.
29	1	2	41		1	2	41		1	1	0		42	Difficult to handle but has shown remarkable emotional change - medication continues.
30	1	2	41		2	2	0		2	2	0		41	More intelligence emerging-retention decidedly poor.
31	2	3	1		2	3	1		2	2	0		2	Showed considerable growth - very difficult home situation - moved from district.

Child	Feeling of Success				Personal Adjustment				Positive Attitude Towards School				Overall Improvement	
	F	S	D		F	S	D		F	S	D			
32	2	3	41		2	3	41		2	2	0		42	Considerable improvement - moved from district.
33	2	2	0		1	2	41		1	1	0		41	Attitude worse - more relaxed - released.
34	1	2	41		3	3	0		3	3	0		41	Return to class Fall, 1972.
35	2	3	41		2	3	41		2	3	41		43	Significant improvement in all areas - released January, 1972.
36	2	3	41		2	3	41		2	3	41		43	Released May, 1972
37	3	3	0		3	3	0		3	3	0		0	Progressing - attitude good - wants to work himself up and out of Workshop.
38	2	3	41		2	3	41		2	3	41		43	Child's ability to communicate continues to improve.
39	1	1	0		2	1	-1		2	2	0		-1	Given psychiatric evaluation - home problems - further psychiatric and neurological evaluation.
40	2	3	41		3	3	0		3	3	0		41	Marked academic improvement as well as peer and personal adjustment.
41	3	3	0		2	3	41		2	3	41		42	Genetic and family history of language problems - good peer relations.
42	2	3	41		2	3	41		2	2	0		42	Released November, 1971.
43	1	2	41		2	3	41		2	3	41		43	Genetic aphasic problems - released from speech therapy - positive change of attitude - increased self confidence - not much growth in academics.
44	2	2	0		2	2	0		2	3	41		41	Reading comprehension and arithmetic computation improving.

DATA TABLE #3

Comparative Scores in Grade Equivalents on the California Achievement Test

For Students in the Prescriptive Teaching Workshop

1971-1972 School Year

Child	Grade	Sept. 1971	June 1972	Change	Average Yearly Gain in Past Schooling	Sept. 1971	June 1972	Change	Average Yearly Gain in Past Schooling	Sept. 1971	June 1972	Change	Average Yearly Gain in Past Schooling
1	2	2.8	4.0	1.2	.9	2.4	4.4	2.0	.8	3.0	4.3	1.3	1.0
2	3	4.2	4.1	.1	1.4	3.0	4.7	1.7	1.0	3.9	4.7	.8	1.3
3	3	3.6	4.8	1.2	1.2	3.4	4.4	1.0	1.1	3.5	3.9	.4	1.2
4	2	2.4	3.6	1.2	1.2	1.4	4.4	3.0	.7	3.2	4.7	1.5	1.6
5	4	2.9	4.3	1.4	.6	4.2	4.9	.7	.8	3.3	4.0	.7	.6
6	4	2.2	4.5	2.3	1.6	2.5	4.7	2.2	.6	2.5	4.0	1.5	.6
7	2	2.8	4.2	1.4	1.4	2.5	4.4	1.9	1.3	2.8	4.2	1.4	1.4
8	3	3.3	4.3	1.0	1.1	3.3	4.2	.9	1.1	3.5	4.4	.9	1.2
9	4	1.9	3.7	1.8	.5	1.5	4.1	2.6	.4	1.4	3.8	2.4	.4
10	2	1.8	3.3	1.5	.9	1.7	3.3	1.6	.9	2.1	3.7	1.6	1.1
11	2	1.7	3.6	1.9	.6	1.6	4.0	2.4	.5	1.7	3.7	2.0	.6
14	4	3.9	4.0	.1	1.0	3.1	3.5	.4	.5	3.8	4.1	.3	1.0
16	3	2.0	2.5	.5	.5	3.3	3.7	.4	.8	2.2	3.0	.8	.8
17	2	1.5	3.4	1.9	.8	1.4	2.1	.7	.7	2.1	3.2	1.1	1.1
19	5	2.1	3.6	1.5	.4	3.8	4.5	.7	.8	4.2	4.5	.3	.8
20	5	3.8	5.3	1.5	.8	4.6	5.6	1.0	.9	3.8	4.7	.9	.8
21	5	3.1	4.6	1.5	.6	4.1	6.1	2.0	.8	2.9	5.0	2.1	.6

Child	Grade	Sept. 1971	June 1972	Reading Change	Average Yearly Gain in Past Schooling	Sept. 1971	June 1972	Arithmetic Change	Average Yearly Gain in Past Schooling	Sept. 1971	June 1972	Language Skills Change	Average Yearly Gain in Past Schooling
22	3	2.2	2.5	.3	.6	1.9	2.8	.9	.5	1.8	2.8	1.0	.5
23	2	1.9	2.5	.6	.6	1.2	2.9	1.7	.4	2.2	2.4	.2	.7
24	3	2.7	3.6	.9	.9	2.4	2.7	.3	.8	2.1	2.8	.7	.7
25	3	2.2	2.7	.5	1.1	2.6	2.9	.3	.9	3.1	3.6	.5	1.0
26	2	1.9	2.1	.2	.6	2.0	2.5	.5	.7	1.9	2.5	.6	.6
27	1	1.0	1.4	.4	.5	1.0	1.2	.2	.5	.7	1.6	.9	.4
28	3	2.4	2.9	.5	.8	1.8	2.9	1.1	.6	1.9	2.7	.8	.6
29	2	1.5	1.9	.4	.5	1.6	2.4	.8	.5	1.5	2.4	.9	.5
30	2	1.4	1.9	.5	.7	1.2	1.4	.2	.6	1.6	2.0	.4	.8
33	1	1.3	2.9	1.6	1.3	1.2	2.8	1.6	1.2	.4	2.1	1.7	.4
34	4	3.1	4.1	1.0	.6	3.3	4.3	1.0	.7	3.6	3.8	.2	.7
35	3	3.1	3.5	.4	1.0	2.5	3.8	1.3	.8	3.2	3.6	.4	1.1
36	1	1.1	1.8	.7	.6	.7	1.6	.9	.4	.0	.2	.2	.0
37	3	2.7	3.9	1.2	.9	1.2	3.0	1.8	.4	2.1	3.4	1.3	.7
38	2	1.4	3.0	1.6	.7	1.1	2.4	1.3	.5	1.3	2.9	1.6	.6
39	1	.9	1.7	.8	.9	.7	1.4	.7	.7	.0	1.2	1.2	.0

Child	Grade	Reading		Average Yearly Gain in Past Schooling	Arithmetic		Average Yearly Gain in Past Schooling	Language Skills		Average Yearly Gain in Past Schooling
		Sept. 1971	June 1972		Sept. 1971	June 1972		Sept. 1971	June 1972	
40	5	2.2	4.1	1.9	3.2	4.8	.6	2.5	3.7	.5
41	3	1.3	1.5	.2	1.2	1.4	.2	1.3	1.7	.3
42	4	4.0	4.7	.7	3.6	4.2	.6	3.4	4.3	.9
43	5	3.1	4.7	.6	4.0	4.2	.2	3.5	4.2	.6
44	3	2.4	2.7	.3	1.6	2.2	.6	1.7	2.5	.4

Complete data are not available for students numbered 12, 13, 15, 18, 31, and 32.

DATA TABLE #4

The following data give the number of children released from the Workshops during the 1971-1972 school year.

Workshop A	10 children
Workshop B	5 children
Workshop C	3 children

PERSONNEL



AND

INSTRUCTION

III. PERSONNEL AND INSTRUCTION

Personnel

Qualified personnel is prerequisite to a successful and effective Workshop. The cooperative efforts of the director, psychologist, learning disability teacher consultant (LDTC), teacher of the handicapped, social worker, and classroom teachers are essential.

The responsibility of coordinating, supervising, and evaluating the Workshop program is that of the Director of Special Services. He also interviews and recommends staff, specifies physical requirements and secures volunteer paraprofessional help as may be needed. In the district described in the model, he also serves as chairman of the Child Study Team. In the model district he enlisted the support of the staff and the administration. The following techniques are recommended: visit an existing Workshop, view the filmstrip-tape overview, read the Technical Brief and Resource Manual describing the Workshop.

Consultative and diagnostic services are offered to the teachers and students involved in the program by the psychologist. Working closely with the psychologist in order to secure social and medical development is the social worker. This responsibility entails establishing a close relationship between home and school and conducting group orientation sessions with parents.

A Prescriptive Workshop teacher must be certified as a teacher of the handicapped. Ideally, this should be an experienced teacher who has taught in a regular classroom and is aware of pupil expectations and curriculum requirements. The background of a certified teacher for the Workshop should include course work in the areas of (1) education of the handicapped, (2) diagnosis of learning disabilities, (3) remediation of basic skills, and (4) materials and methods of teaching children with learning disabilities. This teacher is responsible for teaching approximately fifteen youngsters in academic and perceptual skills in small groups and prescribing their programs and evaluating their progress in cooperation with the classroom teacher. This also includes providing materials for use while these children are in regular classrooms.

Communication

Communications is the key to success of this program. Team planning of the Child Study Team, Workshop teacher, principal, and classroom teachers insures continuous communication, provides in-service training, and encourages eventual total integration of the child into the regular classroom.

Communication is most important in the relationship between the Workshop teacher and the classroom teacher. After-school conferences, team teaching, and Friday observations make this possible. On Fridays, children do not attend

the Workshop. This permits the Workshop teacher to observe these children and others in their own classrooms. It also enables the teachers to have a regular opportunity to discuss the progress and programs of each child. There are some children who will require assignments from the Workshop teacher to be completed in the regular classroom on Fridays using special materials. The Workshop teacher and the classroom teacher cooperate in marking quarterly report cards and meeting with parents.

The principal is involved in team planning with the Child Study Team, classroom teachers and Workshop teacher in the final selection of children for placement in the Workshop, in assigning children to regular classrooms and teachers best-suited to meet their needs, and in planning children's schedules. Additional communications in understanding of special programs and needs is also provided through periodic meetings of principals and the Director of Special Services.

The Director of Special Services is responsible for disseminating information about the Workshop to the Superintendent and parents as well as to the principals. The Superintendent, in turn, publicizes the program to the Board of Education, the public, and agencies outside the school district.

Instructional Strategies

The Workshop accommodates the more seriously disabled learner in those areas which have proven to be frustrational in the regular classroom. At all other times the child remains in the regular classroom working on appropriate materials and using multi-sensory aids.

The children in the Workshop participate in physical education, music, art, and opening exercises with their assigned class. The purpose is to integrate them into the regular classroom whenever possible. This philosophy of mainstreaming the children into their grade level also applies to academics. For example, a child may participate in his classroom reading group and come to the Workshop for instruction in math and spelling. In another case a child may come to the Workshop for writing, perceptual skills, and work habits, while participating in his assigned classroom in all academic areas. The amount of time the child spends in the Workshop depends on his needs. The advantage of the Workshop over supplemental tutoring is that it affords the child a large block of time and a continuity of program.

Children are grouped by age level rather than ability or instructional level, with the younger children in the morning and the older children in the afternoon. Quality rather than quantity of time is stressed. One-to-one instruction provides a greater intensity of attention and better results.

No schedule is permanent; all schedules are altered as a child progresses. Children may be phased into regular classrooms throughout the year or may remain in the Workshop for several years. A child released from the Workshop may be subsequently scheduled for attendance if a later need arises. Remedial reading or supplemental instruction may be prescribed for a period of time to support children being released from the Workshop.

Scheduling will also be affected by the number of children from each grade level. Often the greatest number of children may be from one grade level. Therefore, scheduling is as individual as the children involved. Some children may be scheduled for a block of time in the morning and another block of time in the afternoon. Regular class schedules and special activities will be considered also. It is important to remember that the aim of the Workshop is to support children so that they can function in the regular classroom as much as possible. Caution must be taken not to create such a sheltered environment that the children prefer to stay in the Workshop full time when they may be capable of participating in the regular classroom. Accommodation of these youngsters in their own classroom is the thrust for the future.

Multi-sensory approaches to learning skills in math, reading, and language arts are used in the Workshop. Color coding spelling words, sand tracings, and using tapes, controlled readers, and manipulative materials are examples of methods employed. Recognizing and teaching through the strength modality is strongly adhered to in the program. Use of new teaching materials not associated with earlier failures plus revised materials from the regular classroom are basic strategies of the program. A complete list of materials and equipment begins on page 44.

A representative case study, including an evaluation, prescription, and progress reports of the type of child serviced in the Workshop, follows. The continuous improvement in academic and social areas which this record shows is representative of the progress made by students in the Workshop.

EVALUATION AND PRESCRIPTION

Name: Case Study

Date of Birth: 3-19-62

Date of Evaluation: March, 1970

Evaluated by: Psychologist, LDTC, Social Worker and Psychiatrist

I.Q. 107

Grade Level upon Workshop entrance: 3rd

Summary of Psychological Evaluation: (Details deleted in order to prevent identification of student.)

Diagnosis:

Primary - Emotionally disturbed and socially maladjusted

Secondary - Neurologically impaired

Medical - Evidence of seizures and slight hearing loss

Home - Inconsistent discipline

Test Results:

1. Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test: 129 - superior range.
2. Wechsler Intelligence Scale: Verbal 111; Performance 100; full scale 107 - Upper limits of normal range.
3. Bender-Gestalt Visual Motor Test: Poor Visual Perception; fair visual retention; lack of impulse control.
4. Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test: Errors indicated a problem in the cerebral hemisphere; high frequency hearing loss.

Strengths:

1. Mental ability - evidence of bright-normal to superior intelligence
2. Creativity and imagination
3. Response to structure and discipline

4. Vocabulary and verbal ability
5. Auditory memory
6. Ability to absorb knowledge
7. Enthusiastic and motivated attitude

Weaknesses:

1. Emotionality and lack of discipline in home situation
2. Minimal brain dysfunction
3. Low tolerance for frustration
4. High frequency hearing loss
5. Fantasizes
6. Visual perception
7. Lack of impulse control
8. Coordination
9. Ability to communicate in a written form
10. Academic background - limited involvement in classroom situation

Placement recommended: Specialized school or special class for the emotionally disturbed. The child was serviced instead in the Workshop and integrated into a regular classroom for the major part of the day. He also received weekly psychiatric therapy and medication.

Recommendation:

1. Neurological evaluation
2. A firm, structured teacher who would expect deviant behavior
3. Guidance and supervision
4. Gross and fine motor training
5. Extra supervision in large group activities

6. Parent counseling
7. Medication adjustment
8. Weekly psychiatric therapy

Materials and Methods Recommended:

1. Frostig: Visual-motor and figure-ground.
2. Bradley, Konicki and Leedy: Daily Sensorimotor Training Activities.
3. Weaknesses shown by Psychoeducational Inventory of Basic Learning Abilities.
 - a. gross motor development - throwing a ball, marching, clapping, body localization.
 - b. sensory-motor integration - directionality, handwriting.
 - c. Perceptual-motor skills - visual-form discrimination, visual-motor memory, visual-motor fine muscle control, visual-motor integration.
4. Lesson plans as presented in Remediation of Learning Disabilities by Robert Valett
5. Reading: Auditory and visual methods; enrichment on 2-3 level.
6. Games: Scrambling and fill-ins suggested.
7. Flash card games in Probe and Rescue.
8. Math: Addison Wesley System; knows equations 0-20; 2-0 level.

INTER-COMMUNITY PUPIL PROGRESS REPORT: 1971

Name: _____ 3-19-62
 (Last) (First) (Birth Date) (Home District)

Emotional and neurological _____ 3/70
 (Physical limitations or handicaps) (Date most recent psychol. eval.) (Mental Age)

Ritalin (Medication taken at home) _____ Wics. _____ V:111P:100 F: 107
 (Medication taken during school hours) (Name of I. Q. Test)

A. SCHOOL 3rd grade

California Ach. Upper Primary 6/71 3.7 3.8 3.8 3.6 3.7
 Achievement Test:(Name & Level) Date (Vocab. (Read Comp (Arith. Gr. (Lang. Gr. Total:
 Gr. Level) Gr. Level) Level) Level)

Textbooks: (Title and Publisher) _____ Workbooks: (Title and Publisher) _____

Reading: Stern Structural Reading - Book C _____ Controlled Reader - C _____

Arithmetic: Stern & Gould Structural Math - 2 _____

Spelling: Botal Spelling Patterns - Wide Range Test 1.8 4/70 _____

Social Studies: Limited participation in regular class _____

Science: in 3rd grade _____

Special Learning Problems: Emotionality, neurological dysfunction, developmental lag, low tolerance for frustration and bizarre behavior. _____

Supplemental help during year:

Speech: _____ Coordination training: X
 Physical Ed: _____ Perceptual training: X

School work: Functioning Grade Level _____ Effort and Comments: _____

Reading: Beginning 2' Test _____ motivated with individual help _____

Arithmetic: 3.6 WideRange Ach. Test _____ enjoys math _____

Language Arts: 3rd _____ limited involvement _____

Social Studies: grade _____ very interested _____

Science: 3rd - _____ advanced concepts and interests _____

Other: Lesson plans from Valett, Continental Press Materials, penmanship transparencies, Frostig and Fitzhugh materials. _____

Participating in regular class: Art, music, seatwork _____

Previous placement: Special class for emotionally disturbed. Currently in psychotherapy. _____

INTER COMMUNITY PUPIL PROGRESS REPORT: 1971 (Cont'd)

(Last name) (First name)

Teacher-Parent Conference (Dates): limited formal conferences - frequent phone contact

General Comments regarding attitude and cooperation of parents: no contact with father;
mother - over concerned, emotional and insecure; There is a need for parent counseling
which is not being received to date.

B. PERSONAL

Comments

- a. Good health habits (awareness, adherence): Good
- b. Safety rules (awareness, adherence): Aware - but does not adhere
- c. Self-image: weak
- d. Emotional control: improved greatly
- e. Hearing: check in 9/72 responds with "what?" constantly
- f. Vision: good - relies on visual modality
- g. General health and vitality: good
- h. General behavior and mannerisms: adult-like-bizarre-demanding and attention
- i. Speech and speaking: mature seeking
- j. Work habits: needs structure and organization
- k. Degree of independence: asks for help: demands immediate response
- l. Special problems and help received: gross motor perception
- m. Attendance: excellent: happy and enthusiastic

C. SOCIAL

1. Relationship with peers: often fights, insists on having own way
2. Acceptance by peers: basically well-liked
3. Acceptance of authority: initially defiant: submits if firm
4. Behavior in group situation: fair - difficulty controlling impulses

D. TEACHER'S EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Areas of major growth: emotional control, participation in group
2. Areas of regression or little growth: reading
3. Recommendations for next year: Parent counseling-promotion to 4th grade with
Workshop although there was limited participation in 3rd grade.

<u>3rd Workshop</u>			<u>5/71</u>
(Name or class and level)	(School and district)	(Teacher)	(Date)

INTER-COMMUNITY PUPIL PROGRESS REPORT: 1972

Name: _____ 3-19-62
(Last) (First) (Birth Date) (Home District)

Neurological & emotional 3/70
(Physical limitations or handicaps) (Date most recent psychol.eval.) (Mental Age)

Ritalin Wechsler V: 111 P: 100 F: 107
(Medication taken during school hours) (Name of I. Q. Test)

A. SCHOOL

Achievement Test: Name & Level	Date	Vocab Gr. Level	4.6	4.9	4.4	3.9	4.4	Total:
California Upper Primary	6/72							

Textbooks: (Title and Publisher) _____ Workbooks: (Title and Publisher) _____

Reading: Completed more than words (3²) _____ Macmillan

Arithmetic: Modern School Mathematics - 3, Houghton Mifflin

Spelling: Language Arts Guide - 3rd grade (capable)

Social Studies: 3rd grade

Science: _____

Special Learning Problems: Coordination, communication in written form, emotional disturbance

Supplemental help during year: _____

Speech: _____ Coordination training: _____

Physical Ed: _____ Perceptual training: _____

School work: Functioning Grade Level _____ Effort and Comments: _____

Reading: 4.0 motivated - difficulty completing writing in work book

Arithmetic: 4.5

Language Arts: 4.5)difficulty completing

Social Studies: 4.0)written assignments

Science: 4.0)

Other: Enjoys using reference materials - needs guidance & structure - very curious

Participating in regular class: All areas - enjoys science and social studies

* Release from therapy!

INTER COMMUNITY PUPIL PROGRESS REPORT: 1972 (Cont'd) _____
(Last name) (First name)

Teacher-Parent Conference (dates): November, 1971 - March, 1972 - June, 1972

General comments regarding attitude and cooperation of parents: Mother is cooperative
and apprehensive. Father is reserved and unemotional

B. PERSONAL

Comments

- a. Good health habits (awareness, adherence): Two upper sets of teeth
- b. Safety rules (awareness, adherence): does not adhere
- c. Self-image: inflated as a defensive mechanism - insecure
- d. Emotional control: poor - not encouraged at home
- e. Hearing: doesn't always hear - responds with "what?"
- f. Vision: Good - perceptual problems and reversals
- g. General health and vitality: good
- h. General behavior and mannerisms: Thoughtful - becoming more affectionate
- i. Speech and speaking: Mature - difficulty with some letters
- j. Work habits: poor - but have improved
- k. Degree of independence: very independent - has difficulty concentrating
- l. Special problems and help received: Coordination and emotional outlets
- m. Attendance: Poor due to health

C. SOCIAL

1. Relationship with peers: Likeable, stubborn and antagonizing
2. Acceptance by peers: Improving in regular classroom
3. Acceptance of authority: Tolerates and defies it usually
4. Behavior in group situation: improving - responds to group influences

D. TEACHER'S EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Areas of major growth: Math, reading and spelling
2. Areas of regression or little growth: Writing and attention
3. Recommendations for next year: Promotion to 5th grade - retain in
Prescriptive Teaching Workshop


4th Workshop 6/72
(Name or class and level) (School and district) (Teacher) (Date)

Physical Facilities

Prior to establishing the Workshop, children on supplemental instruction were being serviced in the hallways and occasionally in the cafeteria and storage rooms. Children and materials were being moved constantly. There was a stigma attached to being taken out of the regular classroom to an individualized rather than a group setting.

Although the physical facilities for each Workshop are not ideal, with the exception of one classroom, they are adequate. They are large enough to house the equipment and children. One of the rooms is a converted library workroom; another is a converted coal bin; and the third is a converted nurse's office.

The fourth room was designed as a special classroom, similar in size to other classrooms, with individual study carrels, open shelves for storage of instructional materials, sufficient electrical outlets for equipment, indoor-outdoor carpeting and ceiling tiles for acoustical purposes, and adequate counter tops for work space, displays and projects. The size of this room allows for self-directed activities and the possibility of accommodating a larger group in a specific time period.



SUGGESTED LAYOUT
FOR
PRESCRIPTIVE TEACHING WORKSHOP CENTER

Materials and Equipment

The physical organization of the classroom can affect the learning process. Individual and small group instruction is enhanced if adequate equipment and learning centers are available. Pupil programming in regard to the suggested model will, therefore, become feasible.

The following is a list of recommended equipment and materials. It is offered only as a guide. Each school district must develop its own list based upon its requirements. Included is a brief listing of professional teacher references which proved valuable in organizing a Workshop program.

Regular classroom supplies, such as paper, staples, etc., which are covered in the suggested budget (see Section IV), are not listed. Gross motor equipment is not included, as this is a part of a supplemental program, but is still considered necessary for the success of the program. For a complete list of gross motor equipment and other basic materials, such as plasticine, checkers, and Dolch materials, refer to Programming Learning Disabilities by Robert Valett. Many of the materials can be made by teacher or staff inexpensively.

Materials used in the regular classroom, such as the reading and math series, were incorporated in the Workshop with individual instruction. These materials will vary within each district. Materials in the areas of spelling, social studies, and science are not listed because an attempt was made to use the regular classroom materials with adaptations in methods and presentation.

Continuous evaluation of materials and equipment with regard to appropriateness for age level and effectiveness is essential. New materials and equipment should continue to be added as they become available.

Reading and Language Arts Materials

S.R.A. Word Games
S.R.A. Phonics Survey
S.R.A. Reading Laboratory
Stern Structured Reading Materials
Reader's Digest Skill Builders
Phonics Is Fun Workbooks
Phonic Game Kit
Write and See Workbooks
Phonics We Use Workbooks
Jenn Ditto Masters
Learning Letters and Numerals
Get Set Language Games
Pacemaker Classics
Target Kits (Tapes & Worksheets)
The Checkered Flag Reading Series
The Checkered Flag Audio-Visual
Deep Sea Adventure Series
The "Happenings" Series
Wild Life Adventure Series
The Morgan Boy Series
Economy Classroom Library
Grab Reading Game
Split Reading Game
Continued Language Workbooks
Continental Reading Readiness Dittoes
Language Lotto
Know Your World
Score Series
Buddy's Book of Puzzles
Read, Study and Think
Sullivan Programmed Reading Series
Poster Cards

Math Materials

Flip and Build Cards
Tapes: Beginning Experience In Number Relations
S.R.A. Drill Tape Cassettes
Learning Letters and Numerals Workbook
Flip-Flop Math Puzzles
Stern Structural Arithmetic Program
Three-Track Arithmetic Workbooks
Multiplication Table Records
Beginning Experiences In Number Relations: Tapes
Individual Worksheets: Pacemaker Readiness Series

Math Materials (Continued)

Flex Ed Machine and Grids
Numberline Desk Tapes
Number Line Runner
Add-A-Square
Quizmo
Rock-O
Addo
Add-A-Matic
Heads-Up
Jumbo Dominoes
Continental Press Math Material

Perceptual and Writing Skills Materials

Tracing Templates
Michigan Tracking Materials
"I Can Do It": Visual-Motor Coordination
Frostig Materials
Think-A-Dot
Auditory Stimulator Workbook
We Study Word Shapes
Fitzhugh Plus Materials
Geometric Figure Tracing Templates
ReMarkable Alphabet Series
Touch A.B.C. Boards
Sandpaper Letters
Puzzles
Peg Board Set
Lego
Shape-O-Ball

Equipment

Listening Center with Headsets
Tape Recorder
Record Player
Filmstrip Projector
Audio Flash Card Reader & Program
Controlled Reader & Filmstrips
Flash-X Machine & Grids
Primary Typewriter
Rocking Chair
Peabody Language Kit
Cyclo Teacher Kit
Slant Boards or Slant Top Desks

Suppliers of Materials and Equipment

	<u>Cost</u>
<u>Acadia Press Inc.</u> 438 Adler Street Scranton, Pa. 18505	
Three-Track Program Arithmetic	
<u>Allied Educational Council</u> P. O. Box 78 Galien, Michigan 49113	
Fitzhugh Plus Materials	
Shape Matching	\$ 2.40
Shape Completion	1.55
Shape Analysis	2.55
Plus Markers	.50
<u>Appleton Century Crofts</u> 440 Park Avenue South New York, New York 10016	
Language Lotto	48.00
<u>American Educational Publications</u> Education Center Columbus, Ohio 43216	
Know Your World	.75
Score Series	.35
Buddy's Book of Puzzles	.30
Read, Study and Think	.30
<u>American Guidance Service, Inc.</u> Publishers Building Circle Pines, Minn. 55104	
Peabody Language Kit	
Level P.	125.00
Level 1	52.00
<u>Addison Wesley</u> Sand Hill Road Menlo Park, Calif. 94025	
Geometric Figures Tracing Templates	3.50

Suppliers of Materials and Equipment

Continued

Cost

Bremmer Multiplication Records, Inc.
Wilmette, Ill.

Multiplication Table Records

\$ 7.95

Continental Press, Inc.
Elizabethtown, Penna. 17022

Reading Readiness Dittoes
Modern Math Workbooks
Language Workbooks

3.50 per/set

.66

.66

Creative Teaching Press, Inc.
514 Hermosa Vista Avenue
Monterey Park, California 91754

Grab Reading Games
Split Reading Game

2.00 per/set

2.50

Dexter and Westbrook, Ltd.
958 Church Street
Baldwin, New York 11510

We Study Word Shapes

1.50

E. S. R., Inc.
34 Label Street
Montclair, N. J. 07042

Think-A-Dot

Electronic Futures, Inc.
156 Mt. Vernon Avenue
Mt. Vernon, N. Y. 10050

Audio Flashcard Reader
Headset
Blank Cards (150)
Reading Readiness Program
Phonics Program

300.00

35.00

17.00

660.00

320.00

The Economy Company
5811 West Minnesota
Indianapolis, Indiana 46241

Classroom Library

20.00

Suppliers of Materials and Equipment Continued

Cost

Educational Developmental Labs

3145 Bordentown Avenue

Parlin, N. J. 08859

Controlled Reader	\$ 290.00
Filmstrip Set	87.50
Study Guide	3.50
Flash-X	7.20
Flash-X Card Sets	4.00

Educational Performance Associates

563 Westview Avenue

Ridgefield, N. J. 07657

Auditory Stimulator Workbook	_____
Teachers Edition	_____

Educational Activities

Tapes: Beginning Experiences In Number Relations	24.90
---	-------

Follett Educational Corporation

1010 West Washington Blvd.

Chicago, Ill. 60607

Frostig Materials: Beginning	.81
Intermediate	.90
Advanced	.99
Teachers Manual	1.65

Fearon Publishers

2165 Park Blvd.

Palo Alto, Calif. 94306

Pacemaker Classics	1.75 @
Teachers Manual	free
Math Individual Worksheets	
Pacemaker Arithmetic Readiness Program	
Part A and B	93.00

Suppliers of Materials and Equipment Continued

Field Education Publications, Inc.

609 Mission Street
San Francisco, Calif. 94105

Cost

The Checkered Flag Series Kit A and B	\$ 43.20 @
Target Kits (Tapes and Worksheets) 3 Kits	187.00 @
Checkered Flag Audio-Visual Kits Kits A and B	76.80 @
Deep Sea Adventures Series Teachers Manual	13.20 .75
The "Happenings" Series Teachers Manual	9.60 1.00
Wild Life Adventure Series Teachers Manual	14.40 .75
The Morgan Boy Mysteries Series Teachers Manual	14.40 .75
Cyclo Teacher Kit	49.50

J. L. Hammett Company

2393 Vaux Hall Road
Union, New Jersey 07083

Puzzles (wooden)	2.00
Poster Cards (Vowels, homonyms, etc.)	3.50 /set
Transparency Pencils	2.20 /dozen
Acetate Sheets	5.99 /roll
Numberline Desk Tapes	2.95 /roll
Deskape Fractional Numberline	2.95 /roll
Numberline Runner 0-100	2.00
Pegboard Set	2.00
Add-A-Square	4.00
Quizmo	2.00
Rock-O	3.70
Addo	1.65
Add-A-Matic	4.50
Heads-Up	3.95
Jumbo Dominoes	13.00
Lego	8.60

Suppliers of Materials and Equipment Continued

	<u>Cost</u>
<u>Houghton Mifflin</u> 53 W. 43rd Street New York, New York	
Stern Structural Arithmetic Program	
Kindergarten Kit	\$ 42.00
Starter Set 1	28.50
Starter Set 2	30.00
Starter Set 3	39.00
Workbooks	1.72
Get Set Language Games	42.00
<u>Holt, Rinehart and Winston</u> 383 Madison Avenue New York, New York 10017	
Learning Letters and Numerals	1.20
<u>Instructional Media</u>	
Flip-Flop Math Puzzles	
Addition	12.50
Subtraction	12.50
<u>Jenn Publications</u> 815-825 East Market Street Louisville, Kentucky 40206	
Jenn Ditto Masters	.11 each
<u>Kleeco Publishing Company</u> 600 West Jackson Blvd. Chicago, Ill. 60606	
ReMarkable Alphabet Series	_____
<u>Mafex Associates, Inc.</u> Box 519 Johnstown, Penna. 15907	
Flex-Ed Machine	30.00
Grids:	
Readiness	47.00
1st Grade	47.00

Suppliers of Materials and Equipment Continued

Cost

Lyons and Carnahan Educational Division

407 East 26th Street
Chicago, Ill. 60616

Phonic Game Kit	\$ 39.00
Workbooks:	
Write and See	
Books 1-3	.69 @
Pens	.30
Phonics We Use A & B	.72
Phonics We Use C & F	.81

McGraw Hill Book Co.

Box 404
Hightstown, N. J. 08520

Sullivan Programmed Math	
Books 1-6	.78 @
Teaching Skills 1-4	1.47

Sullivan Programmed Reading Series

Book 1	1.96
Book 1A	2.00
Pre Reader	1.08

3M - Wollensak

Rheem Listening Center	
Headsets	6.75
Cassette Tape	1.05
Jack Box	8.95

Mafex Associates, Inc.

Box 519
Johnstown, Penna. 15907

"I Can Do It" (Visual Motor Coordination)	2.00
Michigan Tracking	
Symbol	1.90
Visual	1.50
Word	1.50
Primary	1.25

Suppliers of Materials and Equipment

Continued

Modern Curriculum Press13900 Prospect Road
Cleveland, Ohio 44136

Phonics Is Fun

Book 1

Book 2

Book 3

CostRoyalAllied Business Machines
Westfield, N. J.

Primary Typewriter

\$ 206.00

Readers Digest Services, Inc.Educational Division
Pleasantville, New York 10570

Elementary Skill Builder Kit

56.84

Random HouseSinger School Division
Westminster, Md. 21157

Stern Structural Reading Series

Books A - E and Primer

1.50 @

Picture Cards (Key)

3.69

Picture Cards (Sound)

5.07

Picture Dictionaries

1.05

Dominoes

2.91

Vocabulary Development Booklets

2.22 /set

S.R.A., Inc.259 E. Erie Street
Chicago, Ill. 60611

S.R.A. Word Games

98.95

Phonics Survey

.20 @

S.R.A. Reading Laboratory

Grades 1, 2, 3

69.95

Grades 4, 5, 6

74.95

S.R.A. Drill Tape Cassettes

223.10

Addition and Subtraction

Suppliers of Materials and Equipment Continued

Cost

Teaching Resources

334 Boylston Street
Boston, Mass. 02116

Flip and Build Cards

\$ 12.95

Touch Aides

1790 S. Juniper Street
Escondido, Calif.

Letters Are Fun

12.95

Winter Haven Lions' Research Foundation

Box 1045
Winter Haven, Florida 33881

Perceptual Form Home Training Guide
Kit and Teachers Tracing Templates

Warren's Educational Supplies

1252 Sylvan Avenue
West Convina, Calif.

Touch A. B. C. Boards

Bibliography of Professional References

Behrmann, Polly and Millman, Joan

How Many Spoons Make A Family? (Primary Math Experiences) California:
Academic Therapy Publications, 1971

Braley, William, M. Ed, and Konicki, Geraldine

Daily Sensori-Motor Training Activities, New York:
Educational Activities, 1968

Bush, Wilma and Giles, Marion

Aids to Psycholinguistic Teaching, Ohio:
Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc. 1969

Educational Services Inc., P.O. Box 219, Stevensville, Michigan 49127

Activity Books:

Plus - Math

Spice - Language Arts

Probe - Science

Spark - Social Studies

Action - Physical Activities

Rescue - Remedial Reading

Anchor - Vocabulary Discovery

Launch - Early Language

Gillingham, Anna, and Stillman, Bessie

Remedial Training For Children With Specific Disability in Reading
Spelling, and Penmanship. Massachusetts:
Educators Publishing Service, Inc. 1960

Improving Motor - Perceptual Skills. Oregon:

A Continuing Education Book, 1970

Kephart, Newell

The Slow Learner In The Classroom. Ohio:
Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc. 1960

Shelquist, Breeze and Jacquot

Resource Handbook for Development of Learning Skills. Oregon
Educational Programmers

Valett, Robert

Programming Learning Disabilities. California:
Fearon Publishers, 1969

Valett, Robert

The Remediation of Learning Disabilities. California:
Fearon Publishers, 1969

Van Allen, Roach

Language Experiences in Early Childhood (Manual). Chicago:
Encyclopedia Britannica Press, 1969

Tests

Botel Reading Inventory, Morton Botel
Chicago, Ill. Follett, 1966

California Achievement Tests. Ernest W. Tiegs and Willis W. Clark
Monterey, California: California Tests Bureau, 1957

Frostig Developmental Test of Visual Perception. Marianne Frostig
D. Welty Lefever, John R. B. Whittlesey and Phyllis Maslow
Chicago, Ill. Follett, 1964

Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities. S. A. Kirk, and James J. McCarthy,
and Winifred Kirk
Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1968

Inventory of Readiness Skills. Roseburg, Oregon:
Educational Programmers Company

Iowa Test of Basic Skills
Hightstown, New Jersey. California Test Bureau

Metropolitan Readiness Test. Gertrude H. Hildreth, Nellie L. Griffiths,
and Mary McGauvran.
New York, New York : Harcourt, Brace and World, 1966

Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test. L. N. Dunn
Minneapolis, Minn. American Guidance Service, 1959

A Psychoeducational Evaluation of Basic Learning Abilities
Palo Alto, California: Fearon Publishers

Public School Achievement Test
Indianapolis, Indiana: Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc.

The Raven Progressive Matrices with Crichton Vocabulary Scale
J. S. Raven. London, England: H. K. Lewis and Co., 1956

S. R. A. Test Battery

Wepmann Auditory Discrimination Test. Joseph Wepman. Chicago, Ill.
Language and Research Associates, 1958

Wide Range Achievement Test. J. F. Jastak, S. W. Bijou, and S. R. Jastak
Wilmington, Delaware: Guidance Associates, 1965

Implementation Steps

What to avoid - Consideration should be given to several areas in regard to implementing a Workshop program. The area of greatest concern centers around what to avoid in adoption. This information can be gained only through experience and insight.

Avoiding possible stigma attached to placement in the Workshop is most important in order to have a successful program. Negative statements and attitudes should be discouraged through in-service training of staff and community orientation. The Workshop itself should not be designated as different from other classrooms. The children attending the Workshop as well as other children should be encouraged to have a positive attitude through the understanding that the Workshop is simply a place where children come to do academic work at their own level and speed.

Parental orientation will help develop this positive attitude and decrease stigma. In the model district children were not placed in the Workshop without their parents' consent and understanding of the program. After consultation and visitation, parents felt that it was possible for this program to meet the needs of their children and realized that they shared in the responsibility of this placement.

Precaution must be taken in the process of referring a child to the Workshop since it is not intended as a receiving station for every child who displays a learning problem. Careful evaluation of the child's problem and progress is necessary to avoid this situation. In the model district children who were primarily behavioral problems or seriously emotionally disturbed were not placed in the Workshop because they would have interfered with the learning climate.

Although the term, slow learner, is relative, children with abilities in this category should not be placed in the Workshop if they are working up to their capacity. Including these children in the Workshop should be avoided because they would be taking places of other children who could benefit from the Workshop. Furthermore, the regular classroom is considered the ideal learning environment and should take preference over the Workshop if it meets the child's needs.

Overcrowding is another factor to avoid when assigning children to the Workshop. Although the Workshop teacher does not meet with all of the children at one time, the responsibility of planning to meet the individual needs and giving one-to-one instruction must be taken into consideration. Placing more than 15 children in a Workshop with no aide is unrealistic and defeats the original purpose of the Workshop. If the Workshop cannot accommodate all the children identified, supportive programs and materials should be used in the regular classroom and the children should be placed on a waiting list. As children are

released from the Workshop, the candidates on the waiting list can be accommodated.

Scheduling is always a problem. Separating older children from younger children should be a rule of thumb with some exceptions. It is important to avoid having children taken out of the Workshop for speech, gross motor training, and other supplemental help. This should be done while the child is in the regular classroom. Siblings or relatives should not be grouped together.

Clerical demands of the Workshop teacher should be minimized. The criterion for requesting information should be its value to the progress of the child. Children should not be subjected to unnecessary testing. The present trend is to test and evaluate progress in problem areas only. Extra duties, such as supervision of playground, lunchroom, or halls, preparation of hallway bulletin board displays, lunch count, and attendance record-keeping should also be avoided as these responsibilities detract from individual planning time and availability for consultation.

In many instances the Workshop teacher is responsible for teaching a child reading or math since the child is not included in his classroom group. This responsibility should be shared with the classroom teacher at all times. Too often the classroom teacher does not accept this responsibility for the curriculum or for the child in general. In order to avoid this situation there must be good rapport between the classroom and Workshop teacher and an understanding of a shared responsibility. Primary responsibility for the child is a function of the classroom teacher. The Workshop is an adjunct placement. Under no circumstances should a child remain in the Workshop for the entire day.

Although the size of the classroom may vary for the Workshop, it is impractical to use a room that is not large enough to contain the essential equipment or allow proper storage space. There must also be enough space for children to spread out while doing self-directed activities.

Modifications - There are several modifications to consider regarding the Workshop. These will vary with the needs of the district: the size of the room, the amount of time children spend in the Workshop, and the type of scheduling used. It is important that other modifications, such as the emphasis on servicing primary grade children, be considered in all districts.

Early identification of learning disabled children in kindergarten or first grade is a preventative measure and essential to the Workshop program. The purpose is to give children help early in their schooling and return them to regular classrooms as soon as possible. Extension of the Workshop to grades six, seven, and eight is another modification which recognizes the needs of the middle school. A further step would be to establish a separate Workshop for the middle school.

Supplemental instruction is an alternative approach. As a rule, children in the Workshop do not receive supplemental tutoring, except where the child can benefit from it. Supplemental help also includes para-professionals, volunteer aides, student teachers, and student helpers as well as qualified teachers employed as supplemental tutors. These people should be trained by the Workshop teacher with an understanding that this may be a temporary assignment depending on their relationship with the children. Student teachers participating in supplemental instruction should be special education majors. Using para-professionals in the Workshop on Fridays for organizing and preparing materials is an ideal modification and worth considering. Student helpers can also be used in preparing materials and in other areas which do not involve teaching, such as listening to children read on the controlled reader.

Although the Workshop has become a repository for learning materials, the major focus is on children rather than materials. Teachers are encouraged to come to the Workshop for materials. In this way the LDTC may use the Workshop as a resource room for each individual school. It is, therefore, the responsibility of the Workshop teacher and the LDTC to keep abreast of new materials and their evaluation.

Materials used in the Workshop are usually different from those used in the regular classroom, providing individual instruction and supplemental help. This modification is specifically used when a child is ready to be phased into the regular classroom on a fulltime basis.

Standardizing the testing procedure is an outgrowth of the Workshop program. Each student should be judged by the same achievement, attitudinal, and psychomotor scales. California's new Criterion Reference Testing is used to test a child's progress in problem areas only.

Phasing-in Suggestions - It is recommended that only one Workshop be implemented per year for the following reasons. The first consideration is financial. Purchasing materials and equipment for a Workshop is expensive initially. Secondly, for logistical reasons it is more feasible to set up one Workshop at a time, thus benefiting from experience. Hopefully, the experience of setting up one Workshop will increase the efficiency and effectiveness of succeeding Workshops.

In-Service Training - In-service training is a by-product of this program in that regular classroom teachers gain insight into methods and materials used by the children in the Workshop from which other children can learn and make a satisfactory school adjustment. In other words, the strategies employed in the Workshop have a broader application in the mainstream of education. Using individually prescribed programs and materials aids the classroom teacher in containing children with learning disabilities in the regular classroom and prepares teachers for helping children overcome handicaps in learning.

Children having less severe problems than those involved in the Workshop follow a prescribed program in regular classrooms geared to subject content either re-written, re-taped, or re-presented. The LDTC is usually responsible for these programs; however, the Workshop teacher may also be involved in supplying materials, thus serving as a resource specialist.

Special meetings or work conferences for teachers in grades K-5 and the Workshop teacher are vital to in-service training prior to establishing a Workshop. The areas to be included are as follows:

- (1) Recognizing and providing for the needs of children with learning disabilities;
- (2) Methods of individualizing instruction in the classroom; and
- (3) Specialized instructional materials and innovative teaching strategies for helping children with learning disabilities.

Viewing the filmstrip about the Workshop and visiting the Workshop in operation are also part of in-service training. Any teacher with a student in the Workshop should visit the Workshop for at least an hour during the first month of school in order to gain a better understanding of its function. Teachers should also read the Technical Brief and the Resource Manual.

In-service training for the Workshop teacher includes attending a summer Workshop in how to replicate a Prescriptive Teaching Workshop; visiting an existing Workshop, special schools and special programs; attending professional meetings, such as the annual conference of the New Jersey Association for Children with Learning Disabilities; and visiting centers such as the Educational Improvement Center.

The use of Special Services personnel (psychologist, speech and reading specialists, etc.) within the district for explaining diagnostic tools or innovative programs in special education is a built-in and continuous part of in-service training.

COST

EFFECTIVENESS



IV. COST EFFECTIVENESS

Budget

The suggested budget is based upon the model district's experience with cost of implementation for the first year of the Workshop.

(1)	Salary of Workshop Teacher	\$ 8,880.00
(2)	In-Service Teacher Training	1,000.00
(3)	Instructional Materials and Supplies	5,500.00
(4)	Equipment	4,500.00
(5)	Orientation of Parents	250.00
	Total	<u>\$ 20,130.00</u>

Explanation of Suggested Budget Items

(1) Salary (\$8,880.00) is based upon the 1972-1973 salary guide for teachers with two years of experience and a B. A. degree. The Workshop teacher should be certified to teach handicapped children.

All other professional personnel, specifically the members of the Child Study Team, are regularly employed staff members of the model district whose salaries are included in the total school budget. In those districts not presently employing a Director of Special Services, psychologist, LDTC, and/or social worker, provision should be made for their services.

Medical, psychiatric, and other health services are provided for in the total school budget.

(2) In-Service Teacher Training (\$1,000.00) includes the following:

(a) 4 workshops for making regular classroom teachers more sensitive to the needs of learning disabled children.

(b) Summer workshops for Workshop teacher in how to replicate Prescriptive Teaching Workshop.

(c) Attendance of Workshop teacher at professional meetings during school year.

(d) Visitation of Workshop teacher to another Workshop in operation, to an Educational Improvement Center, special schools, and other programs.

(e) Additional incentive provided in the contractual agreement between teachers and Board of Education through reimbursement for college credits taken by teachers with prior approval of the Superintendent.

(3) Instructional Materials (\$5,500.00) includes specialized materials necessary to implement the multi-sensory approach to learning, such as Frostig, Stern Structural Reading and Arithmetic, Sullivan Programmed Reading and Arithmetic, and Winter Haven materials. (For itemized cost, see list of instructional materials in Section III.)

Supplies includes general classroom materials, such as paper, pencils, crayons, staples, etc., and test materials.

It is recommended that the full amount allocated for materials, supplies, and equipment not be expended before school begins. An amount should be set aside to cover orders during school year as teacher becomes aware of new materials.

(4) Equipment (\$4,500.00) includes controlled readers, Auditor Flashcard Reader and Command Cards, filmstrips, Language Master and program cards, primary typewriter, Flash-X discs, listening center units, taped materials, tape recorder, sand tracing equipment, magnetic easelboard with letters and numerals, and Cyclo-Teacher. Listening center units and taped materials for grades 1-5 as well as for the Workshop were provided. (See list of equipment in Section III for itemized cost.)

(5) Orientation of Parents (\$250.00) includes meetings for parents on guidelines in home management of learning disabled children. (See Section V for further details about parents' orientation.)

Savings

Each learning disabled child is provided an average of two hours of instruction daily in the Workshop. Prior to the Workshop the model district had provided two hours of supplemental instruction per child per day in order to remediate skills. For 15 children at \$7 per hour, the cost for supplemental instruction was \$1,050 per week or \$39,900 per year. The cost of implementation of the Workshop for the first year was \$20,130. The average per pupil cost was reduced from \$2,666 for supplemental instruction to \$1,342 for the Workshop.

The total net savings to the district is shown below:

Cost of Remediation without Workshop:

Supplemental instruction

15 children x 10 hrs/wk x 38 weeks x \$7 \$39,900.00

Cost of Implementation of Workshop for

First year:

	- 20,130.00
TOTAL NET SAVINGS	\$19,770.00

Prior to enrollment in the Workshop, two children in addition to the above were placed in a special class outside the district. (See Case Study, following Instruction Strategies, Section III, p.34.) The cost to the district was \$3,800 per child per year. Although the change from supplemental instruction and out-of-district placement to Workshop was not predicated on saving the district money, the end result was a more appropriate program with less cost to the district. Once the Workshop is initially equipped, the recurring cost is no greater than the cost of a regular classroom.

Reimbursable Costs

The State of New Jersey provides that 50 percent of all expenditures for special education programs and 75 percent of transportation costs of handicapped children are reimbursable (Rules and Regulations pursuant to Title 18A, Chapter 46, New Jersey Statutes). The Workshop qualifies as an approved, reimbursable facility for handicapped children.

PARENTS

AND

COMMUNITY



V. PARENTS AND THE COMMUNITY

Orientation

In order for a school program to be successful, not only must the professional staff feel that it meets an important need, but also the community and the parents of children who will be involved must see that the program will be beneficial to the children. Once the child is recommended for servicing, it is the responsibility of the Director of Special Services, or his designee, to meet with the child's parents to explain the program more fully. Parents should be brought in to visit the Workshop and meet the teachers, and only with their consent should the children be serviced in the Workshop.

In the model district, continuous communication with parents through conferences with classroom teachers, Workshop teachers, and the Child Study Team is a most important aspect of the program. Parent conferences to discuss children's progress are scheduled for November, May, and as required.

If the district employs a social worker, monthly or bi-monthly group counseling meetings are another aid in keeping communication open between home and school. Another strategy for helping parents to gain insight into the etiology and home management of their children is to have them meet with recognized authorities in the field of learning disabilities. The following persons are suggested: Elizabeth Freidus, Ruth Mallison, and Catherine E. Spears. A brief description of their areas of specialization is as follows:

Elizabeth Freidus -

Instructor at Columbia University

Author - Methodology For Classroom Teacher

The Special Child In Century 21. Seattle, Washington:
Special Child Publications of the Seguin School, Inc.

Ruth Mallison -

Consultant on Educational Therapy, Bleuler Psychotherapy Center,
New York

Education as Therapy. Seattle, Washington:
Special Child Publications, 1968

Catherine E. Spears, M.D. -

Neurological Pediatrician, Child Evaluation Center
Morristown Memorial Hospital
Morristown, New Jersey

Community Education and Participation

In the model district the Summit Area Council of Jewish Women, a community service organization, supplies volunteer aides to help part-time in the Workshop. Each aide is screened by the Council and trained by the Workshop teacher with the understanding that this is a temporary assignment depending on her relationship with the child. Aides work a minimum of one-half day per week. Sometimes more than one aide is assigned to a Workshop. High school students who are considering teaching as a career also serve as volunteer aides for a half-day per week. The elementary school P.T.A. has annually devoted a meeting to the Workshop program. Staff members have participated in describing the purpose, methods, and value of the program. An outgrowth of the interest generated by these meetings has been the contribution of funds by the P.T.A. to the Workshop for field trips and purchase of supplies. Other service organizations, such as the Jaycees, Lions Club, Rotary Club, and Junior League, are a potential source of volunteer help.

More significant than the amount of money contributed by an outside organization is the interest stimulated and supportive public opinion in the community.

Role of the Board of Education

The needs assessment, a description of the kind of facility that met the needs, and a budget proposal covering the cost of staffing, materials, equipment, and in-service training was determined by the Director of Special Services and presented to the Board of Education by the Superintendent. The model district could not underwrite the cost of the Workshop program when it was presented because of a priority on space needs necessitated by the rate of growth and enrollment. The Board granted permission to seek help elsewhere. Application was made to the New Jersey State Department of Education for a grant through Title III, E.S.E.A. under provisions for servicing handicapped children. The Workshop program was approved and funded for a three-year period by the Title III grants.

Reasons for Continued Board Support

The model district's Board of Education has fully assumed the cost of the Workshop program, including the recent addition of a fourth Workshop. Members of the Board recognize that the Workshop is servicing the learning disabled child while keeping him in the educational mainstream. Of greater importance is the effect the Workshop has had upon the educational process of the district. By increasing the sensitivity of classroom teachers to the learning process of children who have unusual methods of learning and improving their ability to individualize instruction, the knowledge of specialists based upon daily diagnostic teaching has diffused itself into the mainstream of the educational process of the district.

The Board recognizes further that the child of average or above-average ability is also benefiting from the program as a result of the increased quantity and quality of classroom teacher time. And, finally, the Board acknowledges the cost effectiveness ratio covered in Section IV.

How to enlist Board support

Orientation of the Board and communications are essential to enlisting support of the Workshop program. Orientation includes the following strategies for Board members:

- (1) Read the Technical Brief entitled Education Programs That Work;
- (2) View the filmstrip-tape overview about the Workshop;
- (3) Visit an existing Workshop;
- (4) Read this Resource Manual;
- (5) Have a representative from the model district present the program and answer questions at a Board meeting.

After the Board has approved the Workshop, the Superintendent assumes the responsibility for keeping the Board informed on the future progress of the program.